



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

German adjective 'Griechisch' (pages 7, 28, 36, 62, 84); "Oesterreichen" is not the proper adjectival form (6); "Vindobona" is not the locative case (6); von Premenstein is called sometimes "Premenstein", sometimes "von Premenstein", while von Domaszewski is merely "Domaszewski"; the title for the *Neue Jahrbücher* is wrong. I do not grasp the principle upon which the table of abbreviations has been prepared. If such common abbreviations as "C. I. L.", "Philol.", "Head, Hist. Num.", etc., are to be given for the benefit of the veriest layman, then why not the abbreviations which are used for other things quite as recondite? For example, what would the layman, who is not supposed to understand "C. I. L.", make of the very first citation, "Jos. B. J. VII, 3, 4", or "Dig. XL, 2, 5", or "Borghesi V, 92", or "Müller H. Buch IV, 2, p. 183", or "Bull. Ac. Roy. Belg.-Lettr. (1905), p. 208", and the like?

There is, finally, a surprising amount of loose or even faulty English. I have in mind sentences like the following: "His connection with Martius Verius . . . practically proves him governor earlier" (91); "Ritterling assumes that Cornelianus was at once recalled, apparently for the purpose of inserting A. Larcus Piscus as governor at this point" (30, n. 130); "Mommson's view is not shown conclusive" (20). The word "only" is not infrequently misplaced (31, 37, 47, 76), and the extremely short Preface is disfigured by two references to the dissertation as a "thesis" (what thesis can it conceivably maintain?), and by the unhappy locution "I would like".

Classical scholars will make little headway in pressing the claims of Greek and Latin for wider recognition in our schemes of Secondary and Collegiate education if they themselves employ slipshod English.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire. By Clinton Walker Keyes. Princeton University Dissertation of 1913. Princeton University Press (1915). Pp. 54.

It has long been known that Diocletian favored the appointment of *equites* instead of *senatores* as provincial governors, but, though the inscriptions plainly showed that this policy was not original with him, the precise provinces, periods and conditions in which the change was brought about had never been determined. To this problem Mr. Keyes devoted his attention, and, considering the scanty and frequently inconclusive nature of the evidence, he was able to reach fairly satisfactory results. He finds that prior to the reign of Domitian the transfer had been effected in Arabia (under Gallienus), Dalmatia, Numidia, Pontus et Bithynia, and possibly Germania Superior, but not in Hispania Tarraconensis, or Syria Coele. In the case of the other provinces there is either no evidence at all, or the evidence is inconclusive. He also conjectures with some plausibility that Aurelian and Probus were mainly responsible (after Gallienus,

of course) for the innovation, but refrains from speculating upon the motives for the change in general, or for the selection of one province rather than another in which to institute it. In a note (pages 16 ff.) the plausible suggestion is made that men who held the office of *praefecti urbi* in the third century were usually *consules ordinarii* at or about the same time.

Chapter II (18-48) contains the evidence for the transfer of the command of a legion from a senatorial *legatus* to an equestrian *praefectus*, and is mainly occupied with a detailed discussion of the offices of the *praefectus (castrorum)* and the *praefectus legionis*, in which some criticisms that cannot readily be summarized here are made upon the views of Wilmanns and von Domaszewski. The statement of Aurelius Victor, that Gallienus was the first to withhold military commands from senators, is supported by inscriptional evidence of both a positive and a negative character. The policy of transferring important commands of *vexillationes* to *equites* is then traced with similar (of course, expected) results. In the final chapter, The Separation of Civil and Military Government in the Provinces (49-54), it is pointed out that this separation was necessarily involved in the notable act of Gallienus concerning military commands, and therefore that here again Diocletian merely completed and gave universal application to a reform which had been begun long before his time.

An interesting and convincing emendation and supplement (unfortunately disfigured by a misprint) is that made on page 13 in C. I. L. VIII, 7001, where *Q. Annlati Celsi* and *A]nnatius Celsus* are proposed for the former supplement and reading *Munlati Celsi* and *M]unatius Celsus*.

Of course the present monograph is devoted essentially to marshalling evidence for what was already recognized in its broad outlines, and (in common with most dissertations) shows no very surprising or novel results. But the method is excellent, the presentation clear and concise, and the conclusions reliable, while good judgment is shown in recognizing the limits of what the evidence can actually prove. The only notable defects are a somewhat inconsistent method of citation, and the failure to provide an index. The latter, in the present almost overwhelming volume of philological literature, when every effort should be made to save the time of all fellow-scholars, is almost an unsocial act.

A query might also be raised about the exact form of the title. Does not the author really mean "in the Roman Empire during the Third Century <of the Christian Era>"? At all events this is the sense in which he actually employs the term "third century". If, on the other hand, the intention was actually to introduce an era reckoned from the foundation of the Empire, the result would be, I fear, an unnecessary complication in chronological references.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

W. A. OLDFATHER.